

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

A. Claim amendments

Claims 32-63 were pending in this case. Claims 32-50 were cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; new claims 64 and 65 were added; claims 51, 52, 53, 59, 62, and 63 were amended to further clarify the invention and to correct for form. Support for new claims 64 and 65 and amendments can be found in the original claims. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced into the application as a result of the current amendment. Claims 51-65 are pending in this application

B. Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested that the Applicants make an election among the inventions of Groups I (claims 32-43); II (claims 44-47); III (claims 48, 49, 62, and 63); IV (claim 50); and V (claims 51-61). The Applicants provisionally elect the invention of Group V for prosecution purposes, with traverse and request that the restriction between Groups III (claims 62 and 63) and V (claims 51-61) be withdrawn. The election is believed to read on claims 51-65.

Upon further review of this request, however, it is believed to be improper and withdrawal is requested. That is, according to MPEP 803, a restriction should never be required unless an examination of all the claims in a single application would be a serious burden on the Examiner. That is true even if the restriction is otherwise proper. Here, the searches involved for the subject matter of claims 62 and 63 (Group III) and claim 52 (Group V) would overlap. That is, claims 52, 62 and 63 are directed to a method and a product prepared by the method and therefore the Applicants do not believe that a search of the claims 62 and 63 of Group III in addition to Group V claims would be a serious burden to the Examiner.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction is improper, that the restriction between the claims of Groups V (claims 51-61) and III (claims 62 and 63) be withdrawn, and that claims 51-65 be examined in this application.

Prompt consideration and entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes this would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Emily Miao
Registration No. 35,285

Date: July 1, 2009

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3200
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-913-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002